DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 374 JC 840 164

AUTHOR Highum, Ann C.
TITLE Assessing Administrator and Faculty Support for Community College Activities.
PUB DATE 3 Apr 84
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (64th, Washington, DC, April 1-4, 1984). For related documents, see JC 840 163-165.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Organizational Objectives; School Surveys; *Self Evaluation (Groups); *Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Cuyahoga Community College OH

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to assess Cuyahoga Community College's effectiveness in carrying out its priorities as judged by faculty and administrators. A 66-item survey instrument, focusing on college goals and objectives, was sent to all faculty and administrators asking them to indicate whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were neutral, disagreed, strongly disagreed, or had no opinion regarding whether particular activities were important and were being done well. Study findings, based on comparisons of the responses of 67.9% of the administrators and 42.3% of the faculty, indicated: (1) there was close agreement between the two groups on their rankings of college priorities, with only 19 of the 66 items showing a large difference in rank order; (2) activities dealing with job training were ranked higher in priority by administrators than by faculty, while faculty ranked services for the deaf and blind and for students with high academic ability more highly than administrators; (3) there was even closer agreement between faculty and administrators on how well the 66 activities were being done, with only 13 items showing a large difference in rank order; and (4) the use of planning to build faculty/administrator consensus was seen as important by both faculty and administrators, but administrators ranked the activity more highly than faculty in terms of how well it was being done. A sample page from the instrument is appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242374

Assessing Administrator and Faculty Support for Community College Activities

by:

Ann C. Highum

Presented to:

American Association of Community & Junior Colleges

National Conference

Washington D. C.

April 3, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ann Highum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 840 164

Ann Highum is Director of Counseling at Yavapai College, Prescott, Arizona and a doctoral candidate in Higher and Adult Education at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

Administrators could study several aspects of organizational effectiveness in order to improve their management of the institution, depending on which theorist and definition they select. However done, it is important to assess our effectiveness as educational organizations so that we can deliberate about our individual institution's direction and plan for the institution's future. As mentioned earlier, one major aspect for such study is the relationships that the college develops with external agencies, especially those on which it depends for resources and support. Another is the institutional climate--how it is perceived and supported by internal groups, such as faculty, staff and students. A third is the identification of its goals, along with a look at the outcomes of efforts to achieve different goals and activities.

Robert Miles' **ecology** model (1980) combines these aspects of the study of organizational effectiveness by looking at the institution's goals and activities in light of how it manages interdependencies between internal and external groups. My study looks at an urban community college in two major ways: the climate of the institution as seen by attitudes and perceptions elicited during interviews with members of internal constituencies, and the activities and goals of the institution, as seen by administrator

and faculty perceptions on a survey instrument.

Miles stresses that the assessor of organizational effectiveness must not only look at the goals of the organization, but also how the various sub-units rank these goals, in a preference ordering. The fundamental issue from the ecological perspective is "whether the mix of goals pursued by an organization is responsive to the mix of expectations held for the organization by interest groups upon which it is critically dependent for functioning..." (p. 375). The assessor can examine the congruencies and incongruencies in the goals, and assess organizational effectiveness in terms of the organization's ability to minimally satisfy these goals. Since the two important groups internal to a community college who are likely to interact in directly carrying out institutional goals and activities are administrators and faculty members, their views on that college's activities are crucial to the study of effectiveness. The congruency or incongruency present between these groups provides a picture of the mix of expectations held for the institution.

Methodology

The preliminary data I will present focuses, then, on activities in the community college which "cluster" to form mission groups which encompass both goals and objectives. The survey instrument (see handout #1 for a sample page) is based on the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) developed by Peterson and Uhl for the Educational Testing Service, and the Richardson,

Doucette and Armenta 1982 Community College Activities Survey. As you can see, this survey elicits perceptions about the importance of the activity, as well as opinions on how well each is being done. It includes 59 items generated in studies done in two Arizona community college districts and 7 items specific to the community college under study, Cuyahoga Community College.

Cuyahoga Community College, located in Cleveland Ohio, was instituted in 1961 for a unique purpose in Ohio: to be a "two year low-tuition college flexible enough to meet the needs of a complex and changing community." Now comprising three campuses, a skills development center and a district administration office, the college serves over 44,000 people annually.

The Community College Activities Survey was administered to all faculty and administrators in April 1983, with follow-ups occuring in June 1983 and January 1984. The return rate was 67.9% for administrators and 42.3% for faculty. Faculty were defined as all those with a title of faculty or program coordinator; adminstrators included all others, who have titles of district administrator, college chief executive, dean, director, or department chair. Demographic data was gathered to insure that the respondents accurately reflect the institution's demographic make-up.

Analysis of Results

In order for college managers to use this data, the areas

where faculty and administrators agree and disagree on institutional activities must be analyzed and highlighted. Statistically, each of the 66 items was analyzed as to any significant mean differences between groups. In a second procedure, these mean values for each item, by group, were used to determine a rank order from 1 to 66, with 1 being the item perceived as most important, and 66 as least important. By examining each group's rank order, administrators can see clearly the areas where agreement or disagreement is apparent, either as to the importance of the activity or the outcome of the activity.

Major Findings

1. For this district, only 19 of the 66 items show a large difference in rank order; that is, having a difference of 7 or more points. In fact, on 24 items, faculty and administrator groups rank their importance exactly the same, or 1 or 2 points apart. This indicates close agreement between the two groups on their rankings of college priorities. It should be reassuring to the district that strategic internal constituencies agree on the general direction of the college.

Further, when one looks at each group's "top 15" items, there are 12 activities common to both lists. Table 1 portrays these activities which both groups see as top priorities for the institution. Adminstrators in most colleges would be gratified to see this much agreement over the institution's top priority activities!

2. Although the general picture for Cuyahoga is one of agreement between the two groups, there are some exceptions, of course. Such items would indicate areas for the district to investigate further as to the type of activity, which groups sees it as more important, and how each group judges how well it is being done.

Table 2 lists some of these items which have large rank order differences for importance. There are several activities which deal with job training programs (Items 48, 51,57). The two groups rank these items fairly highly, but differently in the overall scheme, in that administrators rank each higher in priority than faculty. Activities that deal with local businesses and community groups (10) or with offering courses through alternative means or in actual business and industrial sites (18, 57) are seen as important to do by administration, but are viewed more neutrally by faculty.

There is some disagreement on the relative importance of services for some special populations such as the deaf and blind or offering scholarships to students with high academic ability (Items 4, 25, 7), with the faculty group ranking the activities higher than the administrators. On the other hand, there are many other items which deal with services to "special" groups such as tutoring and support groups for ethnic minorities, women returning to college, students with limited reading and writing ability, and students whose native language is not English, or offering scholarships to minorities and disadvantaged students; there is little or no disagreement between the two groups on any of these.

Planning based on information gathering is a definite priority for both (37), but is ranked much higher by administrators. This planning item, along with items 63, 64, 65 and 66, are 5 of the 7 items written specifically for Cuyahoga. All five are seen as important (with means greater than 4.10), but again, administrators rank them all much higher in priority than do faculty. By viewing such statistical results, college managers could see clearly those areas of disagreement and assess whether attempts should be made to work toward closer agreement.

3. There is even closer agreement between groups on how well these 66 activities are being done, with 34 of the items ranked equally, or only 1 or 2 points apart. There are only 13 items which ranked 7 points or more apart; some of these are listed in Table 3. One such item involves the use of planning as a process to build consensus among faculty and administrators; both groups see it as important (administrators, 10; faculty, 7) but administrators rank it 36th and faculty 59th as to how well it is being done. Another item encompasses various extracurricular activities and intercollegiate athletics as complements to students' educational programs. Administrators and faculty rank this as 39th and 40, respectively, for importance, but 10th and 28th, respectively, for how well it is being done. Similarly, item 29 deals with student government, publications and activities. Administrators and faculty rank it 36 and 29 (respectively) for importance, but 16th and 23rd for how well it is being done. This suggests that these

latter two items describe activities that are being carried out quite well--better than their importance might indicate!

4. Those items which show congruency between the two groups and also are ranked very highly with regard to importance by both, are especially fruitful for discussion--especially if the outcome information on how well each is being done is illuminated. By referring back to Table 1, an administrator could see the faculty and administrator opinions as to outcome for the activities. Those with mean scores less than 4 indicate that the group as a whole is neutral or disagrees that the activity is being done well. Since both groups agree on the importance of the activity, efforts and resources could be concentrated in these areas in order to improve the college's effectiveness in carrying them out.

Many other analyses can be done with the data, to detect areas where important activities are seen differently by various internal groups. Some indications about areas where the organization seems to be effective can be seen, based on overall outcome ratings. Other areas where items receive very low outcome ratings could be evaluated for possible improvement or discontinuance (if seen as unimportant).

Implications

The study of a community college's internal environment can illuminate many areas for discussion and action, as the college seeks to become more effective--to be better at the things that are seen as important. A survey instrument like the Community

College Activities Survey allows the analysis of choices available to college managers and ideas for implementing goals and objectives that match the priorities of important constituencies, especially important internal constituencies.

K. Patricia Cross commented in her 1981 article which analyzed data from studies done using the Community College Goals Inventory, that it appears that "mutual trust and respect among faculty, students and administrators is less prevalent on community college campuses today than it was in the early 1970's." She noted a discrepancy between what people would like to have and what they think they have on their own campuses; if true, morale is certainly lower for those in that situation. So how will we direct the energy and resources found on any community college campus? Dr. Cross suggests that community college leaders could marshall this energy by making it clear that college constituencies are working toward commonly accepted goals and moving realistically within a consensus model. An adjunct function for community college managers could be the attempt to narrow the margin of difference between "is" and "should be" goal priorities--or, in this case, "important to do" and "being done well"--for its internal constituencies.

If the assessment of an institution's goals and activities is to be done in conjunction with planning for its future, such information about the perceptions of important members of that

organization are crucial--both for resolving conflicts about institutional direction and for informing the campus about basic institutional goals and activities.

HANDOUT MATERIALS

Assessing Administrator and Faculty Support for Community College Activities

by

Ann C. Highum

Presented to:

American Association of Community & Junior Colleges

National Conference

Washington D. C.

April 3, 1984

Ann C. Highum is Director of Counseling at Yavapai College, Prescott, Arizona, and a doctoral candidate in Higher and Adult Education at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

HAND-OUT #1 Community College Activities Survey

All questions are about **this** community college, the one where you are presently employed.

Cross through one number after **Important to do** and one after **being done well**.

This college should...

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Being Done or No Opinion
37. Collect systematic information about the community and its businesses and industries to make planning decisions about college programs and services.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
38. Offer credit courses in the arts and sciences, the health, engineering and agricultural sciences, business and other academic areas to students college age or older for their general personal and educational development.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
39. Offer basic hands-on skills training for semi-skilled jobs, in such areas as food services, to adults college age or older to prepare them for immediate employment.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
40. Offer short-term skills training in small appliance repair, tax preparation, investment counseling and other personal services to senior citizens and other interested members of the community to provide them opportunities for self-employment.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
41. Provide counseling and advisement services for personal and academic problems to students.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0
42. Provide special tutoring services and counseling to students whose native language is not English to assist them in benefiting from college courses and programs.	Important To Do	1	2	3	4	5	
	Being Done Well	1	2	3	4	5	0

Table # 12 ITEMS COMMON TO BOTH ADMINISTRATOR AND FACULTY "TOP 15" AND EACH GROUP'S OPINION ON BEING DONE WELL

Item	Admin. Rank	Faculty Rank	Admin. Mean (on being done well)	Faculty Mean	
3. Offer courses, cert., degrees in business and public services, agriculture, technologies, health services and other occupational areas to students college age or older to prepare them for jobs.	1	2	4.44	4.06	
9. Offer courses, cert., degrees in the natural and physical sciences, such as biology, chemistry, physics and geology to students college age or older so they can continue studies toward a bachelor's degree at a college or university.	2	1	4.42	4.21	
15. Use planning as a process to build consensus among faculty and administration	10	7	3.18	1.90	*
20. Offer credit course in the arts and sciences, health, engineering and agric. sciences, business and other academic areas to adult students older than college age so they can continue studies toward a bachelor's degree at a college or university.	7	3	4.29	4.06	
21. Offer courses, cert., degrees in business and public services, agric., technologies, health services and other occupational areas to adult students older than traditional college age to prepare them for jobs.	5	4	4.19	3.97	
37. Collect systematic information about the community and its businesses and industries to make planning decisions about college programs and services.	3	10	3.04	2.75	
38. Offer credit courses in the arts and sciences, health, engineering and agric. sciences, business and other academic areas to students college age or older for their general personal and educational development.	15	8	4.11	3.84	
41. Provide counseling and advisement services for personal and academic problems to students.	9	6	3.83	3.65	

* Means are significantly different, at $p \leq .05$ level

Table 1, continued

Item	Admin. Rank (on importance)	Faculty Rank (on importance)	Admin. Mean (on being done well)	Faculty Mean (on being done well)
51. Offer courses, cert., degrees in office education fields, sich as clerical and typing, keypunch and data entry, stenography and word processing, to students college age or older to prepare them for jobs in these fields.	6	14	4.24	3.99
55. Offer instruction in study skills and academic survival skills to students who are unfamiliar with the demands of college work to increase their chances of success in academic and occupational programs.	11	9	3.28	3.26
56. Offer credit courses in the arts and sciences, health, engineering and agric. sciences, and business and other academic areas to students college age or older so they can continue study toward a bachelor's degree at a college or university.	8	5	4.26	4.05
65. Develop programs to assist individuals seeking retraining opportunities because of unemployment in their primary field.	4	12	3.51	3.19

Table 2 Items with substantial rank differences between groups on "important to do"

Item	Admin. Rank	Faculty Rank	Difference
4. Special assistance to deaf and hearing-impaired to assure them equal access.	26	16	10
7. Scholarships and financial assistance to high ability students to encourage college attendance.	21	11	10
10. Assist local community groups and governments to attract industrial and residential development as a community service.	38	48	-10
18. Courses, certificates and degrees by alternative instructional means--T.V., radio, correspondence, individualized materials.	23	39	-16
25. Special assistance to blind and physically handicapped students to assure them equal access.	29	22	7
37. Collect information about community and businessess to make planning decisions.	3	10	-7
48. Courses, certificates and degrees in hospitality, food services, hotel-motel management, to prepare students for jobs.	12	21	-9
51. Courses, certificates and degrees in office education fields to prepare students for jobs.	6	14	-8
57. Courses, certificates and degrees to employees of local business and industry at their work site to upgrade job skills.	17	34	-17
63. Special services to employees to assist them with personal problems (alcohol or drug dependence, family crisis)	18	35	-17
64. Support affirmative action goals by recruiting and retaining qualified women and minority faculty.	14	25	-11
65. Assist people who need retraining because of unemployment in their field.	4	12	-8
66. Include information about computers in all programs of study to help students develop computer literacy.	13	33	-20

Table 3 Items with substantial rank differences between groups on "being done well"

Item	Admin. Rank	Faculty Rank	Difference
4. Special ssistance to deaf and hearing-impaired to assure them equal access.	27	35	-8
6. Occupational courses and programs to high school students with advanced standing so they can earn credits toward transfer.	30	20	10
15. Use planning as a process to build consensus among faculty and administration	36	55	-19
18. Courses, certificates and degrees by alternative instructional means--T.V., radio, corrspondence, etc.	20	27	-7
28. Courses, certificates and degrees in business, agric., tech., health services to high school age students as part of their educational program.	52	45	7
45. Sponsor intercollegiate athletics and other extracurricular activities(films, concerts, intramural sports) to complement students' educational programs.	10	28	-18
55. Instruction in study skills and academic survival skills to help students unfamiliar with college work.	34	24	10
59. Sponsor student government organizations, publications, and activities to complement the educational programs.	16	23	-7
63. Special services to employees to assist them with personal problems.	26	36	-10
64. Support affirmative action goals by recruiting and retaining qualified women and minority faculty.	24	31	-7

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MAY 11 1984

8118 Math-Sciences Building
Los Angeles, California 90024